

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Michael Bridges,)	C/A No. 4:23-3629-SAL-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
U/M Thompson, U/M Danford,)	
U/M Tolbert, U/M Jackson,)	
Warden Jansen, Lt. Gianelli,)	
Lt. Williams, Lt. Lynch, C/O Taylor,)	
Dr. Anderson, Psych. Department,)	
Lt. Bates, C/O Johnson,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This is a civil action filed by a federal prisoner proceeding *pro se*. This case is before the undersigned due to Plaintiff's failure to comply with the magistrate judge's order dated August 7, 2023, directing Plaintiff to file a motion for *in forma pauperis* or pay the fee and file a complaint with allegations about himself only and not former co-Plaintiffs. (ECF No. 5).


The copy of the Order that was sent to Plaintiff's provided address has not been returned to the court as undeliverable. Thus, it is presumed that Plaintiff received the Order but has neglected to comply with the Order within the time permitted under the Order. The Court has not received a response from Plaintiff, and the time for compliance has passed.

The court has "inherent power to manage its docket in the interests of justice." *Luberda v. Purdue Frederick Corp.*, No. 4:13-cv-00897, 2013 WL 12157548, at *1 (D.S.C. May 31, 2013). It also has the authority expressly recognized in Rule 41(b) to dismiss actions for failure to prosecute. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). "The authority of a court to dismiss *sua sponte* for lack of prosecution has generally been considered an 'inherent power,' governed not by rule or statute but by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962).

Plaintiff has failed to properly respond to the Order within the time ordered. Plaintiff's lack of response indicates an intent not to prosecute this case and subjects this case to dismissal. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)(district courts may dismiss an action if a Plaintiff fails to comply with an order of the court); *see also Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989)(dismissal with prejudice appropriate where warning given); *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982)(court may dismiss *sua sponte*).

Accordingly, this case is dismissed without prejudice. The Clerk of Court shall close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Columbia, South Carolina

Sherri A. Lydon

September 12, 2023

United States District Judge

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.